

OUTLINE OF TRAINING PROGRAM CONDUCTED BY REA EFFICIENCY RATING COMMITTEE  
FOR THE BENEFIT OF RATING AND REVIEWING OFFICIALS

A. INTRODUCTORY REMARKS - Dr. Harlow S. Person, Chm. REA Efficiency Rating Comm.

B. RESPONSIBILITIES OF RATING AND REVIEWING OFFICIALS - John W. Asher, Jr.

1. The Rating Official shall be the person who is immediately responsible for the work of the employee (first person in authority who has supervisory responsibilities).
  - a. If more than one Rating Official, both shall confer and arrive at joint evaluation
  - b. Rating Official makes initial evaluation of employee performance and is one of most important operations in rating process
  - c. Must be honest and unbiased, fair alike to Government and employee
  - d. Rating Official should study manual closely and make every effort to get best information available to do effective rating job
  - e. Each Division has designated a liaison representative between the Division and the REA Efficiency Rating Committee to assist Rating and Reviewing Officials in carrying out the efficiency rating program
  - f. Examples of performance, weak, adequate and outstanding, thought out well in advance of interview, are very effective.
2. The Reviewing Official shall be the supervisor highest in line of authority above the Rating Official who has personal knowledge of the general performance of the employee to be rated and of the standards of performance of the Unit in which the employee is assigned as compared with standards in other Units.
  - a. Reviewing Official has responsibility to review or revise ratings after conferring with Rating Officials and intermediate supervisors
    - (1) Should read manual carefully and prepare himself from best information available on subject of performance rating
    - (2) Should attempt to secure uniformity by discussions with Rating Officials
    - (3) Should discuss changes with Rating Officials and, if necessary, with employee
    - (4) Should adhere to deadlines established by Efficiency Rating Committee.

C. DISCUSSION OF RATING SHEET ELEMENTS

Part I. - Joseph T. O'Brien

1. Elements 1 to 20
  - a. Grouping of Elements: How Well; How Much; Manner of Doing
  - b. Selection of elements within group pertinent to job
2. Elements 21 to 31
  - a. Apply only to administrative, supervisory or planning functions
  - b. Grouping of elements; (1) Policy determination and organization planning; (2) Management and supervision; (3) Leadership
  - c. Selection of elements within group pertinent to job
  - d. Use of elements 15 to 19
  - e. Use of additional elements
3. Similarity of rating elements in groups 1-20 and 21-31.

Part II. - Ray W. Lynn

1. Selection of all elements to be rated: Limit those pertinent to the job

(over)



2. Selection of Underlined elements:
  - a. Critical elements, most important
  - b. Keep underlined elements to minimum
3. Discussion of rating elements on sample form AD-510 (P-4 Engineer)

D. IMPORTANCE OF INTERVIEWS - Mrs. Jane E. Hughes

1. Three Types of Interviews are recommended by Committee:  
Rating Official and employee; Reviewing Official with Rating Official;  
and Reviewing Official, Rating Official and employee, or Reviewing  
Official and employee.
  - a. Interview between Rating Official and employee
    - (1) Time, Place and Manner
    - (2) Value of rating to employee
    - (3) Critical elements and priority of activities
    - (4) Reasons for ratings assigned
    - (5) Employee questions
  - b. Interview between Reviewing Official and Rating Official
    - (1) Time
    - (2) Reasons and statement for rating assigned.
    - (3) Decision as to revision
  - c. Interview between Reviewing Official, Rating Official and employee,  
or between Reviewing Official and employee
    - (1) When
    - (2) Explanation of revision
  - d. Conclusion - Value of interviews.

E. NATURE OF STATEMENT FOR "EXCELLENT" AND "UNSATISFACTORY"

RATINGS - John W. Asher, Jr.

1. REA Efficiency Rating Committee requires written statements for an  
"excellent" rating.
  - a. Statement of "generalities" not acceptable. In fairness to  
employee's personnel record, Committee requires specific examples  
of outstanding performance - the more the better
  - b. Examples of poor and good statements
2. "Unsatisfactory" ratings must be supported by complete factual written  
statements with recommendation for demotion and reassignment or  
termination.
  - a. Written statement must contain valid reasons, with detailed  
instances of unsatisfactory service, and evidence of having  
previously discussed such points of unsatisfactory service with  
the employee.

F. RATING METHODS - WORK STANDARDS - WORK SHEETS - Dr. Harlow S. Person

1. Work Standards - When making a rating the Rating Official inevitably  
has some type of work standard in mind, whether consciously or  
subconsciously.
  - a. Such standards are of two types, as follows:
    - (1) Comparison of the individual performance with the com-  
posite performance of the entire work-group to which  
individual belongs. This method dominantly subjective
    - (2) Comparison of the individual performance with predetermined  
objective standard appropriate to the individual job. For  
instance, for a typist an objective standard may comprise  
such factors as: pages per hour; errors per page; conformity  
to official type page; neatness; etc.
  - b. The Committee requests the cooperation of Rating and Reviewing  
Officials in development of objective standards generally



- c. Not an easy matter, for many REA positions appear at first glance not susceptible of objective standardization
- d. Yet if undertaken seriously we shall be surprised by what can be accomplished
- e. The Administrator is very much interested in the development of work standards and authorizes the Committee to say specifically that it is speaking for him in asking cooperation in this direction
- f. Assistance in developing work standards may be secured from the Office of the Management Engineer, Office of the Administrator.

## 2. Performance Analysis

- a. First step towards objective standards is performance analysis; the breaking down of each individual's job into duties; the functional things actually required of the individual. The job description does not help much here, because an individual's job description may embrace a wider area than is represented by the work actually required at a particular place during a particular period
- b. The Committee this year asks Rating and Reviewing Officials to cooperate in taking this first step; in constructing a basic performance analysis for every position in REA
- c. When this has been accomplished we can then turn to the devising of specific work standards.

## 3. Work Sheets - Illustrative work sheets have been distributed

- a. Explanation of work sheets
  - (1) Selected Form 51 elements at left
  - (2) Other columns for duties
  - (3) Arranged in order of importance from left to right
  - (4) Each duty then rated in respect of each Form 51 element
  - (5) Rating Official then makes a summary rating for each Form 51 element.

## 4. Conference with Employee

- a. Employee should be invited to aid Rating Official in developing the work sheet
- b. Rating Official receives benefit of employee's knowledge of what the employee is doing
- c. Employee gets clearer understanding of what is expected and of relative importance of duties
- d. Improvement of morale
- e. Ultimately better performance.

## G. SUMMARY - Dr. Harlow S. Person

- 1. In connection with ratings of field employees, the following procedure is recommended. After the efficiency rating has been approved by the Reviewing Official, the Rating Official should transmit to the field employees carbon copies of Standard Form 51, "Report of Efficiency Rating" and Form AD-510 "Efficiency Rating Work Sheet". These forms, accompanied by a tactful memorandum complimenting the strength of the employee but containing helpful and constructive criticism of any weaknesses, will serve instead of a personal interview.

## H. QUESTIONS - Dr. Harlow S. Person



